

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
mmao@bsfllp.com
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile: (415) 999 9695

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP**
Andrew H. Schapiro (*pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnmanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
William Christopher Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
bearmody@susmangodfrey.com
Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
srabin@susmangodfrey.com
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

MORGAN & MORGAN
John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
rmcghee@forthepeople.com
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 223-5505

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs; additional counsel listed in signature blocks below

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,
individually and on behalf of themselves and
all others similarly situated.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**JOINT SUBMISSION RE: SEALING
PORTIONS OF THE MARCH 2, 2023
HEARING TRANSCRIPT REGARDING
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Plaintiff,

Judge: Hon. Susan van Keulen

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

1 March 21, 2023

2 Submitted via ECF

3 Magistrate Judge Susan van Keulen
4 San Jose Courthouse
Courtroom 6 - 4th Floor
5 280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

6 Re: Joint Submission re: Sealing Portions of the March 2, 2023 Hearing Transcript
7 Regarding Order to Show Cause
Brown v. Google LLC, Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK (N.D. Cal.)

8
9 Dear Magistrate Judge van Keulen:

10 Pursuant to Your Honor’s March 1, 2023 Redaction Order (Dkt. 881), Plaintiffs and
11 Google LLC (“Google”) hereby jointly propose redactions to the Transcript of Sealed Proceedings
12 for the March 2, 2023 hearing regarding the Court’s October 27, 2022 order to show cause.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 As ordered by the Court on March 1, 2023 (*see* Dkt. 881), Google and Plaintiffs jointly
 3 propose redactions to the Sealed Transcript of Proceedings for the March 2, 2023 Hearing on the
 4 October 27, 2022 Order to Show Cause (“Transcript”). Google contends that the material proposed
 5 for redaction contains Google’s confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive
 6 features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly, including
 7 various types of Google’s internal projects and metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the
 8 ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors.
 9 This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

10 This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Order:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
March 2, 2023 Sealed Transcript of Proceedings	Highlighted portions at: Pages 7:13–15, 7:20, 8:4, 9:19–21, 9:23, 10:15, 10:17, 12:7, 13:3, 14:2, 14:11–12, 14:14, 14:16, 14:19, 19:1, 19:8, 19:13, 19:19, 20:18, 21:24–22:1, 22:3, 22:5, 22:10, 22:12–13, 22:20, 22:23–25, 23:5, 23:9–10, 23:18–19, 25:7–14, 26:11, 27:1, 28:2, 29:22, 32:4, 32:11–12, 33:19–20, 36:10, 36:13, 36:18, 37:5, 39:1, 39:14, 40:8, 40:10, 40:13, 41:12–13, 41:17, 41:19–21, 42:6–12, 42:14–16, 43:3, 44:15, 46:23, 47:16, 47:22–23, 48:13, 48:19, 51:17, 56:18, 60:24, 61:3–4, 61:7, 61:9, 61:14–16, 61:25, 62:2, 62:4, 62:13, 64:13, 64:16–18, 65:22–24, 66:1, 66:6, 67:15, 68:2, 71:14, 72:15, 74:9, 74:19, 74:24, 75:13, 75:19, 75:22–76:2, 76:5–6, 76:24, 77:20, 78:2, 78:7, 78:21, 79:1, 79:6, 79:12, 83:5–6, 83:8, 83:10–11, 83:14–16, 83:19–20, 83:23–84:3, 86:17, 87:1, 87:7, 87:17, 88:9, 88:13,	Google

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	90:2, 90:16, 90:24, 91:19, 92:18, 92:21, 93:25, 94:2–3, 94:5, 94:11, 94:23, 96:7, 100:13, 101:21–22, 102:16, 103:10, 103:13, 103:19, 106:9, 106:11–12, 106:17–18, 106:20–22, 107:23–108:1, 109:20, 112:12, 113:2–3, 114:20, 115:13, 115:23	
---	--	--

The parties conferred on the proposed redactions to the Transcript. Plaintiffs do not oppose sealing the proposed redactions and thus today's submission is presented jointly.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

The common law right of public access to judicial records in a civil case is not a constitutional right and it is “not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (noting that the “right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute” and that “courts have refused to permit their files to serve as reservoirs of . . . sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing”). Sealing is appropriate when the information at issue constitutes “competitively sensitive information,” such as “confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.*, 2014 WL 4965995, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014); *see also Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (acknowledging courts’ “broad latitude” to “prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information”).

III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS EASILY MEET THE “GOOD CAUSE” STANDARD AND SHOULD ALL BE SEALED

Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 589–99. Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg. of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that could harm a litigant’s competitive

1 standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v.*
 2 *Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015)
 3 (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard where that
 4 information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation omitted).

5 Here, the Transcript comprises confidential information regarding highly sensitive features
 6 of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly. Specifically, this
 7 information provides details related to various types of Google’s internal projects, teams and
 8 metrics. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and business
 9 practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with legal
 10 and privacy obligations.

11 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing
 12 it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of
 13 Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, designs, and practices to Google’s competitors. That alone
 14 is a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No.
 15 14-cv-02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3–9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal
 16 certain sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the
 17 integrity and security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,
 18 No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales
 19 data because “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they
 20 do not have”); *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at *8 (W.D. Wash. May 8,
 21 2013) (granting motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is
 22 not publicly available”).

23 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to
 24 compromise Google’s internal systems and data structures. Google would be placed at an increased
 25 risk of cyber security threats, and data related to its users could similarly be at risk. *See, e.g., In re*
 26 *Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material
 27 concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted”

1 because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system”). The security
 2 threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

3 The information Google seeks to redact is the minimal amount of information needed to
 4 protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also
 5 to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations.
 6 The “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either
 7 standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

8 **IV. CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court seal the identified
 10 portions of the Transcript. Plaintiffs do not oppose.

11
 12 Respectfully submitted,

13
 14 /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro
 15 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 andrewschapiro@quinnmanuel.com
 16 Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 josephmargolies@quinnmanuel.com
 17 Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 teutafani@quinnmanuel.com
 18 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
 Chicago, IL 60606
 19 Tel: (312) 705-7400
 Fax: (312) 705-7401

20
 21 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
 sb@quinnmanuel.com
 22 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
 violatrebicka@quinnmanuel.com
 23 Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)
 crystalmixhines@quinnmanuel.com
 24 Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
 alyolson@quinnmanuel.com
 25 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 26 Tel: (213) 443-3000
 Fax: (213) 443-3100
 27
 28 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)

13
 14 /s/ Mark C. Mao
 15 Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
 mmao@bsflp.com
 16 Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No.
 238027)
 brichardson@bsflp.com
 17 Erika Nyborg-Burch
 enyborg-burch@bsflp.com
 18 44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 19 Tel: (415) 293 6858
 Fax: (415) 999 9695

20
 21 James W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)
 jlee@bsflp.com
 22 Rossana Baeza (*pro hac vice*)
 rbaeza@bsflp.com
 23 100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800
 Miami, FL 33130
 24 Tel: (305) 539-8400
 Fax: (305) 539-1304

25
 26 William Christopher Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
 27 Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
 srabin@susmangodfrey.com

1 dianedoolittle@quinnmanuel.com
2 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

4 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
5 jomairecrawford@quinnmanuel.com
6 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
7 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

8 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 josefansorge@quinnmanuel.com
10 Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
tracygao@quinnmanuel.com
11 Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
carlspilly@quinnmanuel.com
12 1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
Washington D.C., 20005
13 Tel: (202) 538-8000
Fax: (202) 538-8100

14
15 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnmanuel.com
16 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
17 Tel: (415) 875-6600
Fax: (415) 875-6700

18
19 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*

20 Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
21 Alexander P. Frawley (*pro hac vice*)
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
22 New York, NY 10019
Tel: (212) 336-8330

23 Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)
abonn@susmangodfrey.com
24 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
25 Tel: (310) 789-3100

26 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
27 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
rmcgee@forthepeople.com
MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
28 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Tel: (813) 223-5505
Fax: (813) 222-4736

29 Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 104805)
mram@forthepeople.com
MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
30 San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: (415) 358-6913

31
32 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

33
34
35
36
37
38

ATTESTATION OF CONCURRENCE

I am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this Joint Submission. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(h)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has concurred in the filing of this document.

Dated: March 21, 2023

By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

Andrew H. Schapiro

Counsel on behalf of Google LLC